

REMARKS

The present Amendment is proposed in response to the Final Rejection mailed July 13, 2007, the Advisory Action dated November 19, 2007, and the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment. In the "Disposition of Claims" section of the Office Action Summary of the Final Rejection, Claims 13-16 were allowed; claims 17-20, 23 and 24 were finally rejected; and claims 21 and 22 were objected to. The present amendment (a) amends Claim 13 to change the phrase "in which in" to --in which-- to correct an obvious typographical error; (b) amends Claims 17 to 20 to recite electroluminescent devices comprising aryl-substituted poly-p-arylenevinylene consisting of a repeating unit of the formula (C1); (c) amends Claim 17 to more clearly define the invention by positively stating the unexpected properties of the electroluminescent device; (d) amends Claims 21 and 22 to correct the obvious errors in the formulae drawings noted in the Examiner's objections in Paragraph 8 of the Office Action, notably (1) in each formula, placing the "0.35" outside the first bracket for an adjacent repeating unit; (2) in formula (C6), inserting the second bracket for the third repeating unit and correcting the second bracket for the second repeating unit; and (e) cancels claims 23 and 24, without prejudice, to expedite the prosecution of this case.

In the Advisory Action dated November 19, 2007, it was indicated that if an amendment in compliance with 37 CFR 1.21.1 and containing the same proposed claim amendments were to be timely filed, claims 13-22 would be allowed and claim 23 would stand rejected. The Amendment filed responsive to the Final Rejection was deemed to be Non-Compliant because the "Remarks" Heading started on the same page as the last claim. The presently proposed amendment cancels Claims 23 and 24, but otherwise contains the same proposed claim amendments as the earlier response. In addition, in the presently proposed amendment, the Remarks begin on a page different from the page containing the last claim and thus is compliant.

Entry of the proposed amendment is respectfully requested since it is believed to obviate all of the Examiner's reasons for rejection and objection in this application, and places the application in condition for allowance without injecting new matter or raising new issues thus obviating the need to proceed with this appeal.

Reconsideration of this application and allowance of all of the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the proposed amendment, the claims in the case are claims 13-22.

In the Advisory Action dated November 19, 2007:

Claims 13-16 were indicated to be allowed, Claims 21 and 22 were objected to, and Claims 17-20 were indicated to be finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as anticipated by WO 99/24526, referring to US2002/0064680 as representing a translation of the international application published as WO 99/24526 to Spreitzer et al. Claims 17-20, as amended by the presently proposed amendment, are no longer subject to this ground of rejection for all of the reasons set forth by Applicant and set forth in the Examiner's reasons for allowance of claims 13-16 and reasons for merely objecting to claims 21-22 in the Office Action dated July 13, 2007. It is submitted that the rejection of claims 17-20 should be withdrawn for all of the reasons of record, and all the claims allowed.

Spreitzer et al fails to anticipate because, among other reasons, it fails to teach each and every element set forth in the claims as amended.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ernestine C. Bartlett/

Ernestine C. Bartlett
Reg.No.22,861
Attorney for Applicant(s)